

May 7, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 6829

the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for a unanimous-consent request.

Book

THE MCGOVERN-HATFIELD AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment to end the war in Vietnam, an amendment to the military procurement bill. This brings to 14 the number of Senators who are cosponsoring that amendment.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader. There is no question that a person cannot hope to end violence in Asia by backing it in America. We are not going to end the war by wringing our hands, by throwing bricks, or by burning buildings. The way to do it is by our constitutional system, in voting yes or no on the question of whether we want the war to continue. I expect that that vote will come in 30 or 40 days, when the military procurement appropriation bill is before the Senate for consideration. Then every Senator will have a chance to go on record before the American people and for the historical record as to whether at this time of crisis in the life of our country he favors the continuance of our involvement in Southeast Asia or would like to end it in the only way Congress can end it; namely, by a curtailment of funds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) will be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the amendment I submitted with the cosponsorship of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) a week ago today, Thursday, April 30, to end the war in Southeast Asia now has the cosponsorship of 12 additional Senator. When I first conceived the idea of an amendment to the military procurement bill to limit further funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to the amount needed to withdraw our forces safely, I did not at first think there was a chance of getting more than a handful of cosponsors. But that was before the invasion of Cambodia, the shocking events at Kent State, and other developments which, I now believe, will, with hard work in the Senate, produce enough cosponsors and votes to carry this amendment. It is the hottest and most hopeful article now sweeping the campuses, concerned churches, and peace-oriented groups in America.

From the beginning, I was determined to seek the broadest possible bipartisan base for this effort, and asked Senator HATFIELD to join me as a Republican cosponsor of the amendment. He readily agreed to do so.

Then, in quick order, the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Republican Senator who had earlier proposed cutting off funds for U.S. military forces in Vietnam, joined as a cosponsor with two highly respected Democratic Senators—the Senator from Iowa (Mr.

HUGHES), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

The modified amendment which I submitted on Tuesday, May 5, with the cosponsorship of Senators HATFIELD, GOODELL, HUGHES, and CRANSTON drew as cosponsors that same day the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG). Then yesterday the junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) joined as cosponsors, with the senior Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) joining today. Thus a total of 14 Senator have joined in 7 days' time as cosponsors.

The dynamics that are unfolding in the Nation and in the Senate lead me to believe that before the Senate votes on this amendment in approximately 30 days, we will have enough votes to carry it. In any event, every Senator will at long last be required to stand up and be counted for the American people and for the historical record on the all-important issue of whether he wishes the war to continue or to end.

Under the Constitution, Congress has no control over this question except by the method of either granting or withholding funds. That question will be voted on in this amendment.

No longer will we merely make speeches lecturing the President on what we think we should do. No longer will we ask him to bear the risk and the opportunity alone of ending or continuing the war. Rather we will force Congress to share that risk and opportunity on a broad bipartisan basis. If the President is fearful of the political recriminations of either continuing or ending the war by withdrawing our forces, this amendment is saying, "Mr. President, we are now going to share that risk with you."

But this amendment does more than that. It seeks to reclaim the constitutional power of Congress over issues of war and peace. It seeks to prevent the arbitrary decisions of the Executive by restoring to the Congress as elected Representatives of the people the power the Constitution intended.

It provides, too, a constructive alternative to citizen powerlessness and despair and violence. For it says to outraged students, to disillusioned GI's and worried parents, to concerned Wall Street brokers, and to disturbed clergymen and other citizens: "Here is the way you can work your will and lift your voice in an orderly, effective way. You can write, telegraph, telephone, or visit with your Senator and Representative, asking their support for this amendment. You can take a piece of paper and ask your fellow citizens to sign it in your neighborhood, at your club, in your office, at your school or college, in your church or labor hall, or elsewhere, pledging their support for the amendment to end the war and their willingness to urge their Representatives and Senators to vote for it."

Already petitions embracing over a hundred thousand signatures including 50,000 names secured by students and faculty at Columbia University have

come to my attention. Let us get 20 million signatures and let us call or write every Representative and Senator, and we will adopt this amendment.

Instead of wringing our hands, or tearing our hair, or throwing bricks, or blocking traffic, or cursing the system, let us go to work on our Senators and Representatives, neighbors and friends, and make constitutional government serve our needs.

This is a prudent, carefully drawn amendment. It cuts off funds for military operations in Cambodia 30 days after passage. It begins the cutoff requiring withdrawal from Vietnam and Laos effective December 31 and concluding with all forces out by June 30, 1971—unless a joint and specific declaration by the President and Congress can demonstrate the need for a specific, publicly recorded reason for an extension of time. In addition to permitting funds for the safe and systematic withdrawal of our forces, it permits funds to arrange for the exchange of prisoners and for asylum in friendly countries for Vietnamese who might feel threatened by our withdrawal.

Let us not talk about Nixon's war or Johnson's war or the Pentagon's war, or the CIA's war. Let us take hold of this war as citizens and as elected representatives and let us vote to end it.

The alternative to ending it is more death and devastation in the civil strife of Southeast Asia, more violence and disorder in our own society, more damage to our own economy in wartime inflation, a jittery, skidding stockmarket, and more erosion of our material and spiritual strength by wasting on war what we need to fight hunger, and answer the crisis in agriculture, housing, unemployment, health care, pollution, and crime.

Many years ago, the ancient Biblical prophet wrote:

I have set before you life or death, blessing or cursing; therefore, choose life that thou and thy seed may live.

Let us choose not cursing but blessing. Not death but life. Let us adopt amendment No. 609 to the military procurement authorization bill (H.R. 17123) to be voted on in the Senate in about 30 days. That amendment will emancipate us from a war we never should have entered, a war that we cannot win and should not want to win. It will save the lives of our troops, stop the incredible destruction of villages, homes, rice crops, and people in Southeast Asia, heal the divisions in our society, nourish our shaky economy, and restore constitutional government in America.

Following is the list of cosponsors as it presently stands:

COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 609

George McGovern, Mark O. Hatfield, Charles E. Goodell, Alan Cranston, Harold Hughes, Lee Metcalf, Daniel K. Inouye, Walter F. Mondale, Stephen M. Young, Birch Bayh, Fred R. Harris, Gaylord Nelson, Mike Gravel, and Vance Hartke.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORTS OF COMMISSIONS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the last few years we have become more aware than ever that the quality of American life depends largely upon how we use—and conserve—our natural resources. It was this growing awareness that prompted the enactment of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965.

That Act provides for the establishment of river basin commissions—if requested by the States in the appropriate area—to plan for the best use and development of rivers, their adjoining land and their resources. The river basin commissions assure that the people within each area will have a voice in deciding how these resources are used. This approach to planning promises more efficient use of America's great natural and man-made wealth, and more attention to preserving the beauty and vitality of our environment.

Today I transmit the annual reports of the four commissions that have been established under the Act. They are the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, the Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Commission, the Great Lakes Basin Commission, and the New England River Basins Commission—covering areas in 21 states.

These annual reports reflect the accomplishments of each commission during Fiscal Year 1969. They describe existing and emerging problems in the use of our river basins, and help in evaluating opportunities for their sound development.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 7, 1970.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I correctly understand that I am now to be recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Before commencing with my prepared remarks, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader. They have expressed themselves well. It is my sincere hope that we can meet with these young people and, as both Senators have so well expressed it, that this can be done without a confrontation of violence, as is advocated by so many people today.

FOREIGN POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I support the

President's recent decision to endorse a combined American-South Vietnamese attack on Communist sanctuaries along the Cambodian-South Vietnam border.

In doing this I take cognizance of the very wide scope of the questioning and debate that is going on, in the Congress and in the rest of the Nation, concerning the basic assumptions of American foreign policy.

Therefore, I want to go beyond consideration of the current tactics we are using in Southeast Asia. I want to make clear how I see the most urgent realities of the international situation as we enter the 1970's.

In evaluating the recent turn of events in Asia it is important to understand the significant successes of American and allied efforts there.

The success of the American policy—from the period of search and destroy missions up to and including this period of Vietnamization—has brought many benefits. Two of them are especially important. One is the destruction of the Vietcong infrastructure in the countryside. The other—and it is related to the first—is forcing the Communists into total reliance on North Vietnamese troops. This has stripped away whatever plausibility originally attached to the myth that South Vietnam's troubles stemmed from "an indigenous peasant revolt" rather than aggression from the Communist nation to the north.

The crucial fact is that the North Vietnamese sanctuaries along the Cambodian-South Vietnamese border have recently become more than sanctuaries. They have become occupied territories, quite remote from even the slightest exercise of Cambodian sovereignty.

It is important to understand why these sanctuaries have been used in this way. The success of our Vietnamization program has made matters very difficult for the North Vietnamese units.

They can no longer rely on the friendship of the local population for aid and comfort. Increasingly outfought on the battlefield by the rapidly improving South Vietnamese Armed Forces, and denied aid and comfort from the South Vietnamese people, the North Vietnamese invaders have been engaging in sporadic fighting and then retreating for rest and resupply in Cambodia.

Were Vietnamization not so successful, the North Vietnamese would not be so dependent on the territories it occupies in Cambodia. But if they were allowed to use these territories unmolested, they could nullify the gains of the Vietnamization program.

Thus our choice was not between continuing the successful Vietnamization program and leaving the Cambodian sanctuaries alone. The choice was to have Vietnamization and a drive against the sanctuaries, or to have neither a successful Vietnamization program nor a realistic hope for honorable disengagement and continuing phased withdrawals.

The hard realities of the situation were such that the President could only choose the policy he has adopted—setting a far-reaching withdrawal schedule, but preparing for this by denying the enemy his sanctuaries. To repeat, the President had to make that choice because the existence

of the sanctuaries posed an intolerable threat to the whole Vietnamization effort that is making the substantial troop withdrawals possible. Now we will deny the enemy his sanctuaries and get on with the troop withdrawals—perhaps even faster than before—or to tolerate the sanctuaries at the risk of jeopardizing our hard-won gains in Vietnamization, and consequently jeopardizing the troop withdrawal timetable.

At this very moment American and South Vietnamese and Cambodian troops are destroying buildings and bunkers and tunnel complexes which are the fruit of five years of labor on the part of the enemy. At the same time the allied troops are uncovering huge caches of food, medical supplies, small arms, mortars, and other war materials. For example, we have found many hundreds of tons of rice and nearly a million rounds of small arms ammunition.

The enemy will not be able to replace any of this easily. Now that the sanctuaries are no longer secure, and now that the Cambodian Government has declared the Communist forces unwelcome, the Communists will have neither the incentive nor the opportunity to rebuild the elaborate fixed installations that we are destroying.

Furthermore, the enemies supply lines are being harassed more and more as a result of the new hostility of Cambodia. Cambodian rice is no longer in ready supply. Access to the sea is threatened. All in all, the enemy's ability to replace the confiscated war materials is diminishing daily.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if we can assume that the President and his advisers are aware of the fact the Senator is making this statement?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator's assumption is entirely in error. This is not true. This speech is made entirely on the responsibility of the Senator from Colorado, without consultation with the administration on this matter in any way.

Mr. LONG. Then, can I assume at least that the Senator is privy to knowing generally what the President's view is on this matter, as well as the view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the State Department with regard to this matter?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have been privy to the same briefings many other Senators have been privy to and that is all.

Mr. LONG. Yes. The point the Senator is making, and I think it is well for everyone to know, is that what the President is doing here does not amount in any respect to a reversal of his decision to gradually withdraw American troops from that area.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think it is to facilitate troop safety that the decision was made.

Mr. LONG. Further, it is well to keep in mind that regardless of the number of American troops that may be there or what our troop strength may be relative to the troop strength of South Vietnam, the question still remains that with forces in South Vietnam and in that area they should be used as they